



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/871,402	05/31/2001	Thomas E. Creamer	6169-226	9871
40987	7590	05/27/2005	EXAMINER	
AKERMAN SENTERFITT P. O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			HOSSAIN, TANIM M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/871,402

Applicant(s)

CREAMER, THOMAS

Examiner

Tanim Hossain

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox (U.S. 5,812, 533) in view of Bladow (U.S. 6,115,040).

As per claim 1, Cox teaches a method of remotely administering a service component comprising: providing at least one administrative option corresponding to a function to be performed by a service component executing in a service logic execution environment (SLEE) (column 3, lines 18-20, 52-63); receiving a user specified administrative option (column 4, lines 29-30); generating a SLEE compatible event based on said user specified administrative option, said event being of a type which said service component has been registered in said SLEE to receive (column 4, lines 26-35; where for the invention to have utility, SLEE compatibility must exist, and the registration for reception in the SLEE is implied by the nature of the invention. Also see column 33, lines 30-56); and routing said event to said service component via said SLEE, said service component processing said event and performing an administrative function consistent with said event (column 3, lines 16-20; column 4, lines 5-7; where the service provisioning via sending an event to the SLEE is implied by the fact that the administrative function is performed. Event processing is necessitated by the existence of the performance of

an administrative function.). Cox also teaches the use of a GUI based format to enable the user to request services (column 3, lines 26-30). However, Cox does not specifically teach the use of a hypermedia document to allow the user to request services. Bladow teaches the use of a web-based format, i.e. a hypermedia document to request and subscribe to Internet services (column 3, lines 2-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ability to request administrative options, executed through SLEE, via a web-based interface, i.e. a hypermedia format, as taught by Bladow, in the system of Cox. The motivation for doing so lies in the fact that Bladow and Cox are from the same field of endeavor, namely the user-driven provisioning of network services. Bladow's teaching implemented into Cox's invention enables further efficiency and user-friendliness in requesting services.

As per claim 2, Cox in view of Bladow teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving administrative information from said service component (Cox: column 3, lines 16-20, 52-63; column 4, lines 5-7; where the performance of the function necessitates the reception of information. A well-known and obvious example includes the reception of an event-log. See also column 9, lines 36-38).

As per claim 3, Cox in view of Bladow teaches the method of claim 2, wherein said received administrative information is real-time information (column 4, lines 26-28; where the provision of service constitutes the reception of administrative information. See also column 9, line 59).

As per claim 4, Cox in view of Bladow teaches a method of remotely administering a service component through a hypermedia document comprising: registering with a service logic execution environment (SLEE) to receive particular SLEE compatible events generated by said

hypermedia document and posted to an event handler in said SLEE (column 4, lines 26-35; where in the execution of the invention, it is necessary that registration takes place in the SLEE, so that the SLEE can execute the inputted command. To implement the command, the use of the event handler is inherent. See also column 33, lines 30-56); receiving an event posted in said SLEE, wherein said received event is one of said particular SLEE compatible events (column 3, lines 16-20, 52-63; column 4, lines 5-7; where the very nature of the invention necessitates the reception of an event posted in the SLEE, and for the invention to have utility, the event must be SLEE-compatible); and performing an administrative function consistent with said received event (column 4, lines 26-35).

Claims 7-10 are rejected on the same bases as claim 1-4 respectively, as claims 7-10 describe an apparatus for implementing the contents of claims 1-4 respectively.

Claims 5, 6, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox in view of Bladow, in further view of Deo (U.S. 6,594,355).

As per claim 5, Cox in view of Bladow teaches the method of claim 4, but does not specifically teach encapsulating and posting event information in the SLEE, which can then be routed to the user. Deo teaches encapsulating in a SLEE, compatible event administrative information (column 15, lines 52-57; where the identifier can qualify as administrative information. Compatibility is inherent for the invention to have utility.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ability to hold event information in the SLEE, as taught by Deo in the system of Cox in view of Bladow. The motivation for doing so lies in the fact that all inventions are from the same field of endeavor,

namely the provisioning of services in a network. As for the posting of the event administrative information to the SLEE and routing this information to a remote user, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include this limitation, as it is well known in the art. Well-known examples include the use of an event log, which is encapsulated in an execution environment and can be routed to a user. The motivation for including this limitation lies in the fact that it is important that the user know what things are being executed by the SLEE.

As per claim 6, Cox in view of Bladow, in further view of Deo teaches the method of claim 5, wherein said provided administrative information is real-time information (column 4, lines 26-28; where the provision of service constitutes the reception of administrative information. An event-log is another well-known example.).

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected on the same bases as claims 5 and 6 respectively, as claims 11 and 12 describe an apparatus for implementing the contents of claims 5 and 6.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on December 21, 2004 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

a. Applicant asserts that "no suggestion of using an administrative service component within the SLEE exists in Cox or any other cited reference." Examiner respectfully disagrees. In view of column 2, lines 1-9; column 9, lines 65-67; and column 27, lines 44-50, each of these teachings suggest the use of an administrative service component within the SLEE. The SDI is

an administrative component operating with the SLEE, as is an SCP, for example. Column 33, lines 18-26 suggest the registration of a component in the SLEE, such that the SLEE can receive this component. Compatibility is achieved by the very nature of the functionality of the invention. Even, as in the Applicant's argument, mapping constitutes system compatibility.

b. Applicant contends that "no other passage of Cox teaches or suggests performing administrative functions remotely." In view of the discussion above, and viewing figure 4, it is clearly shown that services are being performed remotely. Because these services are commands from an authority, they constitute administrative functions.

c. A further contention is that "no motivation exists within the teachings of Cox and Bladow to combine the teachings." Examiner stands by the motivation that having a hypermedia document to implement these functions allows for easier functionality because of its familiarity. See also Beyschlag (U.S. 6,831,915), especially the abstract and column 2, lines 29-47, where the discussion of the SLEE administration takes place in an applet for example.

d. Deo by itself does not contemplate an administrative service component within a SLEE. However, when combined with Bladow and Cox, the component is taught. Motivations provided are sound, as the encapsulation of information in a SLEE would be necessitated for the administrative execution in a SLEE to have utility. Cox also suggests this in column 7, lines 33-64.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanim Hossain whose telephone number is 571/272-3881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Martin-Wallace can be reached on 571/272-6159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tanim Hossain
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145


MARTIN-WALLACE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Application/Control Number: 09/871,402
Art Unit: 2145

Page 8